

REMARKS

[0010] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 16, 18-21, and 30-31 will be pending following entry of the amendment submitted herewith
- *Claims 1-15, 17, 22, and 24-29 are canceled herein*
- *No claims are withdrawn herein*
- *Claims 16 and 18-21 are amended herein*
- *New claims 30 and 31 are added herein*

[0011] Furthermore, new claims 30 and 31 are fully supported by the Application, and therefore *do not* constitute new matter. Support for *these new claims* is found in the specification at least at *page 8, lines 7-16*.

[0012] *New claims 30 and 31 are allowable over the cited documents of record at least because the cited documents fail to describe a first configuration server being configured to receive a second request for configuration information associated with a second re-locatable client device from the second configuration server; and communicate the requested configuration information associated with the second re-locatable client device to the second configuration server.*

Cited Documents

[0013] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- *Deshpande: Deshpande, et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0108768*
- *Pham: Pham, et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,143,288*
- *Durden: Durden, et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,380,258*
- *Finster: Finster, et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0149981*
- *Byers: Byers, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0161395*
- *Cezeaux: Cezeaux, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0199184*

Claims 1-22 and 24-49 Are Non-Obvious Over the Cited References

[0014] Claims 1-22 and 24-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over various combinations of Deshpande, Pham, Durden, Finster, Byers, and Cezeaux. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent Claim 16

[0015] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 16 is moot. Specifically, the various combinations of Deshpande, Pham, Durden, Finster, Byers, and Cezeaux do not teach or suggest the claimed, “receiving a second request for configuration information associated with the client device from a second configuration server;

and communicating the requested configuration information to the second configuration server from the first configuration serve.”

[0016] Consequently, the various proposed combinations of Deshpande, Pham, Durden, Finster, Byers, and Cezeaux do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 17-21

[0017] Claims 18-21 ultimately depend from independent claim 16. As discussed above, claim 16 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 18-21 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites. With regard to Claim 17, Applicant submits that its cancellation herein obviates its rejection.

Claims 1-15 and 22-29

With regard to Claims 1-15 and 22-29, Applicant submits that the cancellation of these claims herein obviates their rejection.

Conclusion

[0018] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Robert L. Villhard/ Dated: June 2, 2009

Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5005)
Registration No. 53725

Reviewer/Supervisor: *Robert C. Peck* (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019
Registration No. 56826